

**EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**June 17-18, 2002**

**6.17.02**

**Members attending:** Mike Suver, Bob Leidich, Chris Treppal, Anjali Mathur, Tim Nieberding, Emily Lee, Kathleen Gaiser, Mary Smith, Dennis Finn, Glenn Landers, Bill Davis, Doug Broussard, Richard King, Lori Kondas, Stu Greenberg, Bill Skowronski, Amy Simpson, Paige Akins, Holly Delisante, Eleanor Bycoski, Reverend Smith

**Members Absent:** Virginia Aveni, Rev. Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domnivic, Kile Dreyfuss-Wells, Elizabeth Shaw, Joe Calabrese, Kevin Snape

**Facilitators:** Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman

The Ohio Air Toxics Group convened for the eleventh time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University.

**April 29 Meeting Summary** – The facilitators promised to have it ready for the Group's approval for the next meeting.

The facilitators reviewed the agenda and noted that they would prepare the meeting summary.

**Review of proposed projects:** General summary descriptions were given for fifteen projects and proponents offered additional clarifications.

**Decision making process**

Facilitators reviewed the consensus rules agreed upon by the Group at the project's outset:

- Those who cannot be there the second day should leave with other members or the facilitators their ideas about the projects to be implemented.
- Not a fixed pie: seeking integration instead of thinking division of the pie.
- Members should always explain why they want what they want, to enable others to craft a solution that meets their needs.
- The package we seek should meet everyone's interests – it does not need to be the ideal project-by-project package – rather, a package people can like.

**Discussion** – should the amount of money available be brought into the discussion?

- The facilitators chose to discuss at the end of the meeting the amount of money still available, to enable crafting a package without that in mind.
- The total number of projects exceeds the amount likely available; some projects double-count; some group members are not comfortable with diesel retrofits for private fleets. However, it is very close - all could be implemented.
- Some activities could be included in the tasks for the fiscal agent's staff.
- The funding limit should not hinder the decision because there are other sources.
- It is important to recognize we are not very far (the total sum available is close to the total for project requests.)

### **Review of the criteria matrix**

The business subcommittee used a matrix of criteria to decide which projects to recommend. They weighted criteria and rated the projects. An informal subcommittee (Bob L. Amy S., Emily L., Glenn L.) worked on screening all projects according to this scheme. The group decided it was not worth computing points in this way. Impact had subcriteria (how much would exposure be reduced? How certain of implementation/the outcomes? How well can these things be measured?) Neighborhood concern was a very important criterion difficult to quantify and rate. It was left to be expressed as a preference during the debate. Cost effectiveness was too difficult to assess - implementability, sustainable reductions, replicability to Cleveland/nation. Each project was scored - lots of 2s or 3s – the group could not agree on some of these. It would be even more difficult to do this with the larger group, so this is only to be shared. Consensus is only needed on the package.

### **Summary:**

- Projects with the highest ranking achieve concrete toxic reductions quickly: diesel retrofit or clean diesel fleets for Cleveland; highway fuel for off-road diesel.
- Next: projects that are as good but would not clearly stick in the long run: electroplaters, household survey, anti-idling, tools for schools
- Lower: inventory (between actual reductions and education projects) because it does not reduce toxics by itself but over time it can actually help (base don other cities.)
- Education projects – those well-tested ranked higher (anti-smoking pledge)
- Low ratings: for programs that are means, and unclear how they would work
- Education programs ranked lowest because they are not direct reductions. Difficult to measure in the short run but significant impact in the long run

Members are thinking about merging projects. Some EPA resources can be brought to bear on some of the projects.

**Grant recipient** for disbursement of projects grants: 3 proposals were submitted; American Lung Association (ALA) met most criteria. Lori Kondas, ALA, was introduced. The 2-year budget was distributed and examined; it includes a full-time staff person, computer, office.

**Group members** used dots to express initial preference for the projects.

**Summary:** \$600K available; \$95K allocated (not all spent); \$150k for coordination; \$350K for projects, close to what it would cost to implement some combined projects.

**For the second night:** members invited to contribute ideas:

- **Packages**
- **More funding**
- **Additional ideas**
- **Recognition event + publicizing/visiting local foundations to present the project/press release**

## 6. 18.02

**Members attending:** Tom McLeary, Joe Calabrese, Anjali Mathur, Tim Nieberding, Emily Lee, Kathleen Gaiser, Mary Smith, Dennis Finn, Glenn Landers, Bill Davis, Doug Broussard, Richard King, Lori Kondas, Stu Greenberg, Bill Skowronski, Amy Simpson, Paige Akins, Holly Delisante, Eleanor Bycoski, Rep. for Krzewicki, Laura Hobson, Mike Suver, Reverend Frank, Reverend Smith

**Members Absent:** Virginia Aveni, Rev. Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domnivic, Kile Dreyfuss-Wells, Kevin Snape

**Facilitators:** Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman

Continuation of the The Ohio Air Toxics Group's eleventh meeting at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University.

The facilitators reviewed the agenda for the second evening and noted that they would prepare the meeting summary.

The facilitators offered explanations of handouts regarding the projects included in an initial package, proposed based on the first day's discussions and initial ranking. Criteria: mix of mobile, stationary and indoors, projects that people are enthusiastic about, holds together, of interest to outside supporters, leverage of \$.

### **Discussion of the proposed package:**

- Ways of combining the small auto refinishing and the inventory because of duplication of information and confidentiality problems. Maybe costs could be cut too.
- **Newsletter:** could be included in the subcontractor duties. Some group members have newsletters so maybe they could add an update, to use channels we already have to get the word out, e.g. Earthday; a separate (simple) newsletter is good because people who contact to know about this process could get the project's newsletter instead of Sierra's or Earthday's.
- **Cleveland municipal school district:** there was a meeting about Tools For Schools and to get their continued support for the bus fleet project. They are willing to work with the Group and put together a high level administrative team; interest in anti-idling, having pamphlets in the buses, etc. ; commitment and real desire to implement the project. Hollie will put together a team to work on asthma and environmental and health concerns and meet regularly. Much enthusiasm. (Thanks to Hollie for enabling the meeting.)
- **Project marketing:** Beyond the logo, need a way to get the message out. Continuous outreach is part of the grant recipient's duty: In the next few months the ALA will elicit the group's suggestions.

- **The RTA buses project (low-sulphur fuel)** leveraged 1.8 million, picking up the differential cost between the low-sulfur fuel and the regular for a year (to be added to the funding for projects). To continuing the RTA project need to encourage more people to use this fuel, so the price could come down and it could sustain itself better than with less usage. We need incentives. What are the barriers and how can we eliminate them? (It is being tested in NY, Washington and Cleveland; there is no incentive to go to a higher cost fuel.) One way to make it possible is to identify other fleets and have a centralized supply for the whole Cleveland area. Over the next years the price differential will vanish due to an EPA requirement. So the advantage is doing it earlier than mandated for everyone else. Emission levels are comparable to CNG buses.
- **The highway diesel fuel for offroad vehicles** can have a tremendous impact with almost no money down. It will take a lot of follow-up and work (maybe the project administrator can do that).
- **Retrofits:**

**Fuel neutrality:** encourage others to convert to natural gas. RTA is helping NASA do this by letting them use the fueling facility. The city of Cleveland probably has the largest fleet of diesel-type vehicles they run through the city - get them on board. Have more resources go to schools than to the private sector. (be fuel neutral, focus on need). The criterion should be “the best fuel mix” for most reductions/\$ rather than “fuel-neutral”. One organization is interested in putting CNG on the table too and could not go along (for consensus) in the absence of fuel neutrality. The current proposal gives \$ to schools for a specific technology after having assessed the most effective way to get reductions. We are seeking matching contribution, for reducing risk to children. Then focus on a fleet, perform a fleet audit, come up with the best technology for the task.

**Discussion:** how to allocate the requested \$200K (in the proposed package) between schools and businesses

  - **Recommendation 1:** approve the project as is, evaluate the schools fleet and spend accordingly since there is a agreement that the schools are a priority.
  - **Recommendation 2:** we could allocate more to schools but we should not focus just on schools.
  - Preference for leaving 150K for schools (600 buses, 400 in the 2 neighborhoods) because they are less able to compete.
  - Ohio EPA has a supplemental project list. It requires a very detailed proposal. So if less money is allocated now, it does not mean the projects for schools will not be funded at all – more money can be leveraged for schools.
  - On the EPA web-page: voluntary retrofit program. Examples from this page. Wide range of commitments nation-wide. We could use the page as a launching pad to show interest for schools and private fleets. There is momentum we could tap into.
  - A lot of benefit could be derived from getting a subgroup to draft some proposals to foundations and other sources of funding. Write up a 2-paer to be used a s a marketing tool.

- **Recommendation 3:** let the implementation team work on detail after the allocation has been made for this project.
- **Recommendation 4:** commit at least 100K for schools and begin the process and then the implementation group can figure out how much more can go to schools. EPA will do the needs analysis. – It takes a few weeks.
- **Recommendation 5:** allocate 250K: 150K for schools; drop funding for other projects.
- **Summary:** the group allocates at least \$100K to check what technology can achieve a cleaner fleet. The remaining 100K distribution depends on the analysis.
- **Tie breaker proposal:** EPA will fund the \$43K allocated for Tools for Schools freeing the funds for the clean fleet project: \$150K for school, \$93K for competition.
- Commitment to find more funding for the schools – easier than for private fleets.
- Ask schools to work on the anti-idling campaign and as they are spending a large amount for repairs, to use clean fuels in the process. (off-road vehicles for construction) – model language for other contracts, an opportunity for some legal language (pro bono work for the local Bar Association); also good for press release. Approach Alcoa Foundation for additional school funding.
- **Indoor and ed campaign:** need for translations of materials (into Spanish, Chinese).

**Proposal for ways to package the projects:**

- **The Clean Air Century Campaign** as glue for sustainability.
- 3 different ways of grouping the projects according to what they have in common (under the Clean Century umbrella) – good for arranging partnerships, so everyone can do what they can (e.g. education/reduction):
  1. **by what they accomplish** (information/education, preventative, reduction-oriented)
  2. **by types of pollutant sources** – mobile, indoor, stationary
  3. **by audiences** – business, public, individual
- Use the groupings by context and purpose (applying to foundations or forming partnerships; explore industrial donors, use the OH Manufacturing Association)
- The Clean Fleets should go strictly for heavy-duty technology
- Amend the name for “Campaign administration” – to Campaign Staffing and Support
- Check that current allocations sum up to \$600K.

**Pat tested the consensus,** by asking if anyone disagrees with the proposal as is.

**Consensus was achieved.**

**Communications ad-hoc group formed:** Anjali, Glenn, Rev. Smith, Amy, Tim, George, Bill D., Richard, Mary – will work on recognition event too

**Projects to move forward quickly:** cleaner fleets for schools (add Joe, Hollie, Janet), key person: Paige; schools should be contacted in coordination with all other projects (Tools for Schools, transportation pieces).

**Next meeting:** July 16 (Tuesday)– review communication plan, examine write-up, talk about transition to ALA coordination, other concerns of implementation teams, EPA role.